## **EXHIBIT A**

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AUSTIN DIVISION

PNC BANK N.A., COLUMBIA HOUSING SLP CORPORATION	)		
Plaintiffs, vs. 2013 TRAVIS OAK CREEK GP, LLC, 2013 TRAVIS OAK CREEK DEVELOPER INC CHULA INVESTMENTS LTD., RENE O. CAMPOS, Defendants.	) )Case ) ) ) )	No.	17-CV-584-RP

EXCERPT TRANSCRIPT OF OPENING STATEMENTS
AND TESTIMONY OF DAVID HASSELWANDER IN THE

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT PITMAN, TUESDAY JULY 21, 2017, 10:00 A.M.

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: ROBERT M. HOFFMAN, ESQ. JAMES C. BOOKHOUT, ESQ. DAVID P. WHITTLESEY, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANT: KENNETH B. CHAIKEN, ESQ. WILLIAM S. RHEA, ESQ.

MILLICENT M. LUNDBURG, ESQ.

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript  $produced\ using\ computer\ aided\ transcription.$ 

1	<u>INDEX PAGE</u>		2
2	OPENING STATEMENTS:		<u>PAGE</u>
4			
5	By Mr. Hoffman By Mr. Chaiken		3 13
6	By MI. Charken		13
7			
8	<u>WITNESSES:</u>	F	PAGE
9	<u>For the Plaintiff:</u>		
10	DAVID HASSELWANDER Direct Examination By Mr. Bookhout		37
11	Cross-Examination By Mr. Rhea Redirect Examination By Mr. Bookhou	t	71 109
12	Recross-Examination By Mr. Rhea		123
13			
14			
15	EXHIBITS:		
16	<u>For the Plaintiff:</u> OFFERED	RECEIVED	REFUSED
17	3 40 4 44	40 44	
18	7 57 63	57 63	
19	11 65 12 67	65 67	
20	37 41 47	113 48	
21	45 60 114	56 115	
22			
23		RECEIVED	REFUSED
24	11 59 93	91 93	
25			

MORNING SESSION, JULY 21, 2017

\*\*\*\*

(The following transcript is an excerpt of the OPENING STATEMENTS, and testimony of DAVID HASSELWANDER, as per the request of ordering counsel.)

\*\*\*\*

## OPENING STATEMENT

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. May it please the Court. Your Honor, here's where everybody is at 10 a.m. today. There was a \$26-million construction loan by Chase on this project. It's a short-term loan. It was supposed to be paid off before or by May of this year. It was not paid off. It went into default. It threatens foreclosure. It threatens to take this property, this -- of this single-purpose entity away from this partnership and lose everything that that partnership -- lose the entire purpose of this partnership's existence.

Now the Court might be wondering under normal commercial -- normal commercial situations, why hasn't there been a permanent loan to take out the construction loan? That would be what we would all expect. And that gets us to the basics of this matter that's before the Court.

The general contractor, Weis Builders, filed a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And there's no dispute -- you will not see a Certificate of Substantial Completion signed by the builder. Those are beyond dispute.

So what are the defendants saying, you might wonder? Well, these are ticky-tacky defaults under the partnership agreement. These were circumstances beyond our control. Don't count these. They're immaterial. They're immaterial.

Your Honor, by definition, since they can't get a permanent loan to avoid the default of the construction loan, and because of these three defaults -- these three breaches of the partnership agreement, they are by definition material to the livelihood, the existence of this partnership.

Your Honor, Weis Builders not only filed a lien, but it filed a lawsuit to foreclose on its lien. As you know, in Texas that's the way a mechanic's lien is foreclosed on, so we already have one foreclosure proceeding in the works in action.

Chase, because it wasn't -- it was a \$26-million loan was defaulted on, Chase has sent a Notice of Default. Chase has sent off partnership funds of nearly a million dollars. Chase has said we're going to continue pursuing our rights and remedies. And as the Court is well aware, banks are regulated. They are highly regulated.

highly regulated industry.

There is no way that a regulator is going to allow Chase to carry a \$26-million loan -- a bad loan, defaulted loan on its book when there is a \$50-million apartment complex sitting for the taking at a foreclosure sale.

I don't doubt that Chase wants to see what happens at this hearing before it pursues foreclosure remedy. And, in fact, Chase has a lawyer here today to watch and to monitor this hearing.

But if -- if Chase isn't bought out quickly, if Chase -- the Chase -- the default isn't resolved quickly, the partnership is gone, the property is gone. And more importantly -- well, as importantly is a better way to say it -- this property is designated "affordable housing," the next buyer, the next owner after foreclosure -- it, he, she -- they don't have to designate it affordable housing. This property is in danger of losing its affordable-housing designation.

That's where we are 10 a.m. today. Here's where we urge the court to be at 5 p.m. today: if the injunction is granted and the first general partner, Travis -- yes, first general partner, Travis Oak GP -- is enjoined from interfering with our partnership right, our automatic right under the partnership, for them to accept the removal and let Columbia Housing act as the general partner, as the

## <u>CERTIFICATE</u>

I, Pamela J. Andasola, Certified Shorthand
Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter, Federal Certified
Realtime Reporter, in my capacity as Official Reporter do
hereby certify that I was present and recorded the above
proceedings in stenotype and reduced the same to typewritten
form, that the foregoing 127 pages constitute a true and
complete record of the proceedings, to the best of my
ability, had and done on July 21, 2017, before the Honorable
ROBERT PITMAN, Courtroom 4 of the United States District
Court, Western District of Texas, Austin Division.

Dated this 31st day of August, 2017.

<u>s/Pamela J. Andasola</u> PAMELA J. ANDASOLA, CSR/RMR/FCRR